

Decision of the Colorado Department of Education
Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

State Complaint SC2025-652
Denver Public Schools

DECISION

INTRODUCTION

On December 18, 2025, the parent (“Parent 1”) of a student (“Student”) identified as a child with a disability under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”)¹ filed a state complaint (“Complaint”) against Denver Public Schools (“District”). The Colorado Department of Education (“CDE”) determined that the Complaint identified two allegations subject to its jurisdiction for the state-level complaint process under the IDEA and its implementing regulations at 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.151 through 300.153.

On December 22, 2025, upon agreement of the parties, the CDE extended the 60-day investigation timeline to allow the parties to participate in mediation consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 300.152(b)(1). Mediation resulted in impasse and the CDE resumed the investigation on January 14, 2026.

The CDE’s goal in state complaint investigations is to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and promote positive parent-school partnerships. A final written decision serves to identify areas for professional growth, provide guidance for implementing IDEA requirements, and draw on all available resources to enhance the quality and effectiveness of special education services.

RELEVANT TIME PERIOD

The CDE has the authority to investigate alleged noncompliance that occurred not more than one year prior to the date the Complaint was properly filed. 34 C.F.R. § 300.153(c). Accordingly, findings of noncompliance shall be limited to events occurring on or after December 18, 2024. Information prior to December 18, 2024 may be considered to fully investigate all allegations.

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT ALLEGATIONS

¹ The IDEA is codified at 20 U.S.C. § 1400 *et seq.* The corresponding IDEA regulations are found at 34 C.F.R. § 300.1 *et seq.* The Exceptional Children’s Education Act (“ECEA”) governs IDEA implementation in Colorado.

The Complaint raises the following allegations subject to the CDE’s jurisdiction under 34 C.F.R. § 300.153(b)² of the IDEA:

1. District did not provide Parent 1 with proper notice of an Individualized Education Program (“IEP”) meeting held on December 8, 2025, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.322.
2. District did not afford Parent 1 the opportunity to participate in the development, review, and revision of Student’s IEP at an IEP meeting held on December 8, 2025, as required by 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.321, 300.322, and 300.501(b)(1).

FINDINGS OF FACT

After thorough and careful analysis of the entire Record,³ the CDE makes the following findings of fact (“FF”):

A. Background

1. Student is seventeen years old and transferred to a District school (“School”) in September 2025 from another Colorado district. *Response*, p. 1; *Interview with Parent 1 and Student’s Case Manager (“Case Manager”)*. He qualifies for special education services under the disability categories of Other Health Impairment and Specific Learning Disability. *Exhibit A*, p. 20.
2. Student is “an incredibly self-aware student,” “very smart,” and “likes to be funny.” *Interviews with Parent 1 and Case Manager*. He is “really personable” and “good at developing relationships.” *Interview with School’s social worker (“Social Worker”)*. Student struggles to focus and sit still. *Interviews with Parent 1, Case Manager, and Social Worker*.
3. This investigation will determine whether District provided Parent 1 with proper notice for, and afforded Parent 1 the opportunity to participate in, a December 8 IEP meeting. *Complaint*, p. 4.

B. District’s Policies, Practices, and Procedures

4. District’s Senior Manager of Special of Education (“Senior Manager”) accurately described District’s responsibility to provide notice to parents for IEP meetings, specifically ensuring that parents have enough advance notice to attend and to include in the written notice what will be discussed and who will be present at the meeting. *Interview with Senior Manager*.

² The CDE’s state complaint investigation determines if District complied with the IDEA, and if not, whether the noncompliance results in a denial of a free appropriate public education (“FAPE”). 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.17, 300.101, 300.151-300.153.

³ The appendix, attached and incorporated by reference, details the entire Record.

Senior Manager also described that District policy is that both parents have equal rights to both notice and to attend IEP meetings. *Id.*

5. District's written procedures include that the case manager must send a notice of meeting to parent(s) early enough so that they will have an opportunity to attend. *Exhibit G*, p. 19. The meeting should be scheduled for a mutually agreed upon time and place. *Id.*
6. Senior Manager explained that District has specific parts of the IEP meeting where staff are trained to seek parental input and ask open-ended questions. *Interview with Senior Manager*. District's written procedures provide:

[P]arents are integral members of their child's IEP Team. The IDEA requires that school districts take steps to ensure that one or both parents have the opportunity to have meaningful participation in meetings related to the identification, evaluation and educational placement of their child. If neither parent can attend an IEP meeting, the public agency must use other methods to ensure parent participation in IEP development, including individual or conference calls.

Exhibit G, at p. 25. The "school may conduct an IEP meeting without a parent in attendance if there is no response to the notice, or if the school is unable to convince the parents to attend. School personnel must attempt to secure parental participation." *Id.* at p. 26.

7. District provides training for new staff when they are hired. *Interview with Senior Manager*. District uses an online system—Enrich—that teachers receive access to once they complete their training. *Id.* District also provides multiple layers of supervision and direct coaching throughout the year. *Id.*

C. The December 8 IEP Meeting: Scheduling and Attendance

8. Student enrolled in School on September 2, 2025. *Response*, p. 2; *Interview with Parent 1*. At this time, his other parent ("Parent 2") provided an affidavit to School affirming parental status and indicating that Student resided with Parent 2 full time. *Exhibit H*, p. 194.
9. On September 8, Parent 1 met with Social Worker and provided background information on Student. *Response*, pp. 3-4; *Interviews with Parent 1 and Social Worker*. This included that Parent 1 is Student's sole guardian and that he lived with Parent 1 his whole life until recently when he moved in with Parent 2. *Interviews with Parent 1 and Social Worker*. Parent 1 made it clear during this meeting Parent 1 wanted to be involved with Student's education. *Id.*
10. After receiving Student's transcripts and IEP from his prior school, School determined it needed to conduct Student's triennial evaluation. *Exhibit A*, p. 4; *Exhibit H*, p. 53; *Interviews with Social Worker and Case Manager*.

11. On October 7, Case Manager contacted Parent 1 and Parent 2 to inform them of the reevaluation and that consent would be sent home. *Exhibit H*, p. 53; *Interview with Case Manager*.
12. On or around October 10, District sent a consent for reevaluation to Parent 2. *Interview with Case Manager*. Parent 1 did not receive this. *Interviews with Case Manager and Parent 1*. This is because notices and consent forms in District are auto populated and sent out through Enrich to the listed legal guardian. *Interviews with Senior Manager and Case Manager*. Parent 2 was the only listed legal guardian in Enrich at this time. *Interview with Case Manager*.
13. Throughout October and November, Parent 1 reached out to School, District's legal department, and District's superintendent's office regarding guardianship of Student. *Exhibit H*, 58-59, 81-84, 92-100; *Interview with Parent 1*; *Exhibit 5*, pp. 5-7. Specifically, Parent 1 expressed concern about not receiving communication regarding IEP paperwork and meetings. *Exhibit H*, p. 58. Parent 1 also informed staff repeatedly that Parent 1 was the only legal guardian for Student and asked for the documentation District was relying on to determine Parent 2 was a legal guardian. *Id.* at pp. 58, 82, 92.
14. On October 31, School's Principal ("Principal") told Parent 1 that School had been informed only Parent 2 had educational decision-making authority and thus Parent 2 would be contacted regarding the IEP. *Exhibit H*, p. 59. Again, on November 19, Principal emailed Parent 1 that guidance from District's legal department was that although Parent 1 had rights to Student's educational records, Parent 2 had sole educational decision-making authority. *Id.* at p. 95.
15. On November 21, Case Manager called Parent 2 to schedule an IEP meeting to review the reevaluation and revise the IEP. *Id.* at p. 55; *Interview with Case Manager*. School and Parent 2 scheduled the IEP meeting for December 9. *Exhibit C*, p. 3.
16. Parent 1 emailed Case Manager on December 2 to request a complete set of Student's educational records. *Exhibit H*, p. 107. Case Manager responded with the requested documents on December 3. *Id.* at p. 106. In this same email, Case Manager also informed Parent 1 that Student's reevaluation would be completed on December 9 and asked if there was a time that worked for Parent 1 to "review the current evaluation and IEP information before the finalization of his re-evaluation and IEP." *Id.* Case Manager added "[School] can also share the finalized evaluation and IEP once the documents are completed." *Id.*
17. On December 4, District's superintendent's office informed Parent 1 that parental status had "not been terminated or reduced by District." *Exhibit 5*, p. 5. On or around this date, Principal acknowledges School began considering Parent 1 as an individual with educational decision-making rights, to include updating the Enrich system to list Parent 1 as a guardian and communicating with Parent 1 about Student's IEP. *Interview with Principal*.

18. That same day, Case Manager shared with Parent 1 that an IEP meeting with Parent 2 had been set for December 8. *Exhibit H*, p. 105. Parent 1 asked if there was a time between December 8 and December 15 to meet “to review the documents.” *Id.* Case Manager stated that District had been “following ongoing guidance from legal regarding educational information.” *Id.* On December 5, Parent 1 asked for the time of the December 8 IEP meeting. *Id.* at p. 104. Case Manager responded that it was scheduled for 1:30 p.m. and to “let us know when you would like to meet to go over the draft IEP and evaluation information.” *Id.*
19. School intended the email communication on December 3-5 to be an invitation for Parent 1 to attend the IEP meeting. *Interview with Case Manager*. Parent 1 did not understand it was an invitation to attend that meeting. *Interview with Parent 1*.
20. On December 5, School provided Parent 2 with a notice of meeting (“NOM”) which indicated the purpose was to review the reevaluation and revise the IEP. *Exhibit C*, p. 3. The NOM indicated that the meeting was to be held on December 8, 2025, at 1:30 p.m. *Exhibit C*, p. 3. The NOM included the meeting location as School. *Id.* It also included the participant roles of Administrator, General Education Teacher, Parent 1, School Nurse, School Social Worker, and Special Education Teacher. *Id.* District concedes it did not send the NOM to Parent 1. *Interviews with Principal, Case Manager, and Parent 1*.
21. Student, Parent 2, one of Student’s general education teachers, Case Manager, Social Worker, School Nurse, and Principal attended the IEP meeting on December 8. *Exhibit A*, p. 2. Parent 1 did not attend. *Interviews with Parent 1, Case Manager, Social Worker, and Principal*.
22. During the meeting, the IEP team reviewed the reevaluation and revised the IEP. *Exhibit C*, p. 3. The IEP includes parental input from Parent 2. *Id.* at p. 11. The prior written notice embedded in the IEP notes that “District is willing to schedule an additional meeting with [Parent 1] to consider input.” *Id.* at p. 19.

D. Post-December 8 IEP Meeting

23. Following the December 8 IEP meeting, Parent 1 emailed Case Manager asking for information about the meeting and Student’s draft IEP. *Exhibit H*, pp. 104, 108. Case Manager responded with a copy of the reevaluation report and draft IEP. *Id.* at p. 108.
24. After reviewing the IEP, Parent 1 contacted School to express concerns about the IEP, involvement in the process, and with being listed as a parent in the IEP. *Id.* at pp. 70, 113.
25. Principal and Social Worker spoke with Parent 1 over the phone on December 12 to schedule an IEP meeting to ensure Parent 1’s input was included in the IEP. *Interviews with Principal and Social Worker; Exhibit H*, p. 131. During the phone call, School’s understanding was Parent 1 agreed to an IEP meeting on December 16 at 2:30 p.m. *Interview with Case Manager*

and Social Worker. Parent 1 indicated there was no agreement for this date and time. *Interview with Parent 1.*

26. District created a notice of meeting for Parent 1 and Parent 2 on December 15, 2025, to reflect a meeting to be held on December 16 at 2:30 p.m. *Exhibit C*, p. 1. District did not ultimately send the notice to anyone when it became apparent Parent 1 was not planning on attending the December 16 meeting. *Interview with Case Manager.* This is because, by phone and e-mail on December 15 and December 16, Parent 1 expressed to Principal, Case Manager, and Social Worker that Parent 1 would only meet with the IEP team on the condition that District recognize Parent 1 as Student’s “sole parent with education decision-making authority.” *Exhibit H*, pp. 164, 169, 239; *Interviews with Principal, Case Manager, and Social Worker.* District did not, and could not, satisfy this condition because Parent 2 also has educational decision-making authority. *Exhibit H*, p. 183.
27. No IEP meeting was held on December 16, or thereafter, since the sole purpose of the meeting was to consider Parent 1’s input. *Interviews with Case Manager, Principal, Social Worker, and Parent 1.* On December 17, School asked Parent 1 to let School know if she had another date and time she wanted to have an IEP Meeting. *Exhibit H*, p. 176. Parent 1 did not respond. *Exhibit H*, p. 176-179; *Interviews with Principal and Case Manager.* Student transferred to a new District school in January 2026. *Exhibit H*, p. 50; *Interview with Parent 1.*

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the Findings of Fact, the CDE enters the following CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

Conclusions to Allegation Nos. 1 and 2: District did not provide Parent 1 with proper notice of an IEP meeting held on December 8, 2025, or afford Parent 1 the opportunity to participate in that meeting, as required by 34 C.F.R. § §§ 300.321, 300.322, and 300.501(b)(1). This resulted in a denial of FAPE.

A. “Parent” under the IDEA

“Parent” for the purposes of the IDEA includes individuals identified under a judicial decree or order to act as the parent of a child or to make educational decisions on behalf of a child. 34 C.F.R. § 300.30. “In situations where the parents of a child are divorced, the parental rights established by the Act apply to both parents, unless a court order or State law specifies otherwise.” 71 Fed. Reg. 46,568 (2006).

Here, Parent and Parent 2 share decision-making authority with respect to Student’s education. (FF #s 8, 12, 17, 26.) Thus, the CDE finds that Parent 1 and Parent 2 are a “Parent” for the purposes of IDEA and thus are both entitled to the parental rights established by the IDEA.

B. Notice of Meeting

Parent 1's concern is that she did not receive a NOM for a December 8, 2025 IEP meeting. (FF # 3.)

i. Legal Requirements

School districts must notify parents of IEP Team meetings "early enough to ensure they have an opportunity to attend" and schedule meetings at a mutually agreeable time and place. 34 C.F.R. § 300.322(a). The notice must indicate the purpose, time and location of the meeting, along with who will be in attendance, and inform parents that they may invite other individuals. *Id.* § 300.322(b)(i)-(ii). The notice does not have to identify the meeting attendees by name, so long as it identifies those individuals by position. *See Letter to Anonymous*, 50 IDELR 259 (OSEP 2008); *Letter to Livingston*, 21 IDELR 1060 (OSEP 1994).

ii. The December 8, 2025, IEP Meeting: Notice

In this case, District acknowledges that Parent 1 did not receive a NOM for the December 8 IEP meeting. (FF # 20.) This was due in large part to Parent 2 being listed as the only legal guardian for Student in District's Enrich system, which auto populates and sends special education correspondence such as a NOM. (FF #s 12, 14.) Parent 1 had contacted various District staff in October and November with concerns about not receiving communication regarding IEP meetings. (FF # 13.) School told Parent 1 that only Parent 2 had decision-making authority and thus would receive such communication (FF # 14.) Parent 1 eventually learned from Case Manager on December 4 that an IEP meeting had been set for December 8. (FF # 18.) On December 5, Parent 1 asked for and received the time of the meeting, with Case Manager adding "let us know when you would like to meet to go over the draft IEP and evaluation information." (FF # 18.) Although District suggested that prior email communication from December 3 – December 5 was an invitation for Parent 1 to attend the December 8 meeting, this was unclear to Parent. (FF #s 16, 18.) Nevertheless, that communication does not meet the requirements of 34 C.F.R. § 300.322, both in terms of scheduling the meeting early enough and at a mutually agreeable time and place, as well as in terms of notice contents. (FF #s 16, 18.) For these reasons, the CDE finds and concludes that District did not comply with 34 C.F.R. § 300.322.

B. Parent Attendance and Participation

Parent 1's concern is that District did not afford Parent 1 the ability to participate in the December 8 IEP meeting. (FF # 3.)

i. Legal Requirements

"The parents of a child with a disability must be afforded an opportunity to participate in meetings with respect to" the (1) identification, evaluation, and educational placement of a child and (2) the provision of FAPE to the child. 34 C.F.R. § 300.501(b)(1-2). This is because the IDEA's procedural requirements for developing a child's IEP are designed to provide a collaborative

process that “places special emphasis on parental involvement.” *Systema v. Academy School District No. 20*, 538 F.3d 1306, 1312 (10th Cir. 2008).

ii. *The December 8 IEP Meeting: Attendance and Participation*

In this case, Parent 1 did not attend the December 8 IEP meeting. (FF # 21.) This is because Parent 1 did not receive a NOM. (*Id.*) The IEP team, including Parent 2, convened on December 8 to review Student’s reevaluation and revise his IEP. (*Id.*) A prior written notice embedded in the IEP indicates that “District is willing to schedule an additional meeting with [Parent 1] to consider input.” (FF # 22.) Parent did not receive the IEP until after the meeting, at which time Parent 1 sent an email to Case Manager asking about the meeting and for the IEP. (FF # 23.) For these reasons, the CDE finds and concludes that District did not comply with 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.321, 300.322, and 300.501(b)(1).

C. Denial of FAPE

Procedural noncompliance of the IDEA may result in a denial of FAPE only to the extent that it (1) impeded the child’s right to a FAPE, (2) significantly impeded the parent’s opportunity to participate in the decision-making process, or (3) caused a deprivation of educational benefit. 34 C.F.R. § 300.513(a)(2); see *Knable ex rel. Knable v. Bexley City School Dist.*, 238 F.3d 755, 765-66 (6th Cir. 2001).

Here, the CDE finds and concludes that the noncompliance with respect to the NOM and IEP meeting attendance significantly impeded Parent 1’s opportunity to participate in the decision-making process for Student. Student transferred into District in September 2025, and District recognized Student was due for a triennial reevaluation. (FF #s 8, 10). Parent 1 was not able to attend December 8 IEP meeting, and thus did not meaningfully participate at the meeting. (FF #s 12, 15, 20-22). Accordingly, the CDE finds and concludes that this noncompliance resulted in a denial of FAPE.

The CDE recognizes, and will take into consideration in ordering remedies to address the denial of FAPE, that District attempted to correct this noncompliance shortly after the December 8 IEP meeting. (FF #s 25-27.) District added Parent 1 as a legal guardian in Enrich to ensure Parent 1 will receive special education correspondence and notices. (FF # 17.) District also attempted to schedule an IEP meeting with Parent 1 for December 16 to receive her input for IEP. (FF #s 25-26.) Rather than agree to meet, Parent 1 stipulated that such meeting could occur only if District designate Parent 1 as the sole individual with educational decision-making authority for Student. (FF # 26.) This request is not only something District cannot grant, but it is also inconsistent with the IDEA’s collaborative process that places special emphasis on parental involvement. (*Id.*) On December 17, District let Parent 1 know that it was still willing to schedule an IEP meeting on a date and at a location that would work for Parent 1. (FF # 27.) Parent 1 has not responded. (*Id.*)

Systemic IDEA Noncompliance: This investigation does not demonstrate noncompliance that is systemic in nature and likely to impact the future provision of services for all children with disabilities in District if not corrected.

Pursuant to its general supervisory authority, CDE must consider and ensure the appropriate future provision of services for all IDEA-eligible students in District. 34 C.F.R. § 300.151(b)(2). Indeed, the U.S. Department of Education has emphasized that the state complaint procedures are “critical” to the SEA’s “exercise of its general supervision responsibilities” and serve as a “powerful tool to identify and correct noncompliance with Part B.” *Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities*, 71 Fed. Reg. 46,601 (Aug. 14, 2006).

Nothing in the Record suggests that the noncompliance in this investigation is systemic. District’s written procedures and established practices are consistent with IDEA. (FF #s 4-7.) Indeed, staff accurately described District’s responsibility to provide notices of meetings to parents and to seek meaningful parent participation in the IEP development process. (FF #s 4-6.) This included District staff explaining that it provides notice and seeks parental participation from both parents when parents are separated. (*Id.*) Instead, the noncompliance here is isolated to the specific circumstances of this investigation. (FF #s 8-20.) District has now acknowledged Parent 1 as a parent with educational decision-making rights and has added her to the Enrich system. (FF # 17.) Indeed, the noncompliance in this specific circumstance has already begun to be remedied by District. (FF #s 25-27.)

REMEDIES

The CDE concludes that District did not comply with the following IDEA requirements:

1. Provide Parent with proper notice of an IEP meeting held on December 8, 2025 as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.322.
2. Afford Parent the opportunity to participate in the development, review, and revision of Student’s IEP at an IEP meeting held on December 8, 2025, as required by 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.321, 300.322, and 300.501(b)(1).

To demonstrate compliance, District is ORDERED to submit a corrective action plan (“CAP”) by **April 10, 2026** that adequately addresses how the cited noncompliance will be corrected through the completion of the following remedies:

1. Final Decision Review

- a. Senior Manager, Principal, and Case Manager must read this Decision in its entirety, as well as the requirements of 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.321, 300.322, and 300.501(b)(1), by **April 24, 2026**. If these individuals are no longer employed by District, District may substitute individuals occupying identical roles to

demonstrate compliance with this remedy. A signed assurance that this information has been read and reviewed must be provided to the CDE no later than **April 28, 2026**.

2. IEP Meeting

- a. District must convene Student's IEP team, specifically to include Parent 1 and Parent 2, at a mutually agreeable date and time, by **April 24, 2026**. In consideration of all recent evaluations of Student and the concerns identified in this Decision, Student's IEP team must review, and as appropriate, revise Student's IEP consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.321, 300.322, and 300.501(b)(1).
- b. If Parent 1 refuses to participate in the IEP meeting, conditions her attendance on Parent 2 not being present, or conditions her attendance on the District recognizing her as the only parent with educational decision making, District is not required to convene an IEP meeting, provided District diligently attempts to secure Parent 1's and Parent 2's participation at a mutually agreeable time and place, documents such efforts, and obtains written confirmation from Parent 2 he agrees the IEP meeting need not be convened. A determination that District diligently attempted to secure Parent 1's and Parent 2's participation rests solely with the CDE.
- c. By **May 8, 2026**, District must provide notice of the IEP meeting, proof the meeting was scheduled at a mutually agreeable date and time, proof of attendance of IEP Team members (such as a signature page), and a finalized IEP to the CDE. Should Parent 1 refuse to participate in the IEP meeting, the only documentation required by this date is the diligent attempts by District to schedule an IEP meeting with Parent 1.

NOTE: CDE Special Education Monitoring and Technical Assistance Consultant will contact District with specific instructions for securely submitting the documentation detailed above. The CDE will approve or request revisions that support compliance with the CAP. After approval of the CAP, the CDE will arrange to conduct verification activities to confirm District timely correction of the areas of noncompliance. If District does not meet the timelines set forth above, it may adversely affect District's annual determination under the IDEA and subject District to enforcement action by the CDE.

CONCLUSION

The Decision of the CDE is final and is not subject to appeal. *CDE's State Complaint Procedures*, Section E, ¶ 2. If either party disagrees with this Decision, the filing of a Due Process Complaint is available as a remedy provided that the aggrieved party has the right to file a Due Process Complaint on the issue with which the party disagrees. *Id.*; see also 34 C.F.R. § 300.507(a); 71

Fed. Reg. 156, 46607 (August 14, 2006). This Decision shall become final as dated by the signature of the undersigned State Complaints Officer (“SCO”).

Dated this 11th day of March, 2026.

Tara Carone

Tara Carone
State Complaints Officer

APPENDIX

Complaint, pages 1-6

- Exhibit 1: Birth Certificate
- Exhibit 2: Act of Guardianship/Address-Residence Affidavit
- Exhibit 3: Emails with High School
- Exhibit 4: Emails with DPS Legal Department
- Exhibit 5: Emails with Superintendent
- Exhibit 6: Draft IEP
- Exhibit 7: Cease-and-Desist Letter to Denver Public Schools

Response, pages 1-8

- Exhibit A: IEPs
- Exhibit C: Notices of Meetings
- Exhibit D: PWNs
- Exhibit F: District's Calendar
- Exhibit G: Policies and Procedures
- Exhibit H: Correspondence
- Exhibit I: Contact Information
- Exhibit J: Verification of Delivery

Reply, pages 1-3

- Exhibit 8: Parent Portal Screenshot

Telephone Interviews

- Parent 1: January 30, 2026
- Senior Manager: January 30, 2026
- Case Manager: February 4, 2026
- Social Worker: February 4, 2026
- Principal: February 4, 2026